

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title:           Unresolved Issues for Crime Prevention Research**

**Author(s):                 Stephen P. Lab**

**Document No.:           215348**

**Date Received:           August 2006**

**Award Number:           1999-C-IJ-014**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.**

<p><b>Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.</b></p>
---

FINAL

## UNRESOLVED ISSUES FOR CRIME PREVENTION RESEARCH

Steven P. Lab  
Criminal Justice Program  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Presented to

The Office of Research and Evaluation  
National Institute of Justice

## Table of Contents

Defining Crime Prevention	3
Parameters for the Discussion	4
Research Methodology	7
Research Approach	10
Where Are We, and Where Should We Go?	12
Categorizing the Crime Prevention Issues	13
Physical Design/Access Control Efforts	14
Neighborhood Mobilization	20
Partnerships for Crime Prevention	22
School-Based Prevention	29
Prevention Programs for Businesses	35
Individual Prevention Activities	38
Community Initiatives	40
Fear of Crime	46
Developmental Prevention	48
Firearms Control	49
Anti-Gang Programs	50
Repeat Victimization	52
Summary	53
References	55

“Crime prevention” often elicits a diverse array of ideas and responses when raised in a discussion. All too often the term evokes images of neighborhood watch and physical design, and little else. This is an unfortunate situation since crime prevention is (and should be) at the heart of almost everything done in response to crime problems— from working with neighborhoods to programs in schools to emerging interventions and treatments with offenders. Most of what can be envisioned as crime prevention, however, is scattered under an array of rubrics, including policing, drug use and abuse, education, juvenile justice, prosecution, treatment and rehabilitation, and other headings. The fact that prevention is diffused throughout the operations of the criminal justice system and other social service agencies means that much of what we know is scattered and appears in fragmented fashion. Many prevention topics receive (a little) attention from a variety of agencies; a few topics are the subject of major initiatives by a single agency or a small group of interested parties; and some are left unaddressed altogether.

Given this state of affairs, it is not surprising that crime prevention remains a topic that receives minimal systematic attention and takes a second place to other topics. While crime prevention may be the ultimate goal, most programs and interventions never even use the term. What is needed is to make crime prevention a more central and overt part of society’s efforts at controlling and eliminating crime. This can only be accomplished by tying together the diverse threads of crime prevention into a more unified, consistent package of activities. The present paper attempts to move crime prevention in that direction by offering an overview of important prevention issues that cut across many of the subareas throughout which it is currently scattered.

This review is the result of a project commissioned by the National Institute of Justice to potentially outline a research and evaluation agenda covering the area of "Crime Prevention." As such, the project was to develop a plan which could be used by the staff of NIJ to help direct future endeavors of the agency. The fact that NIJ handles numerous research and evaluation portfolios covering a wide range of criminal justice issues and topics, of which crime prevention is only one, means that some of the issues which could be included under the crime prevention heading (see later in this document) were already being addressed under other initiatives (and by other Department of Justice and non-justice agencies). Thus, the topics included in the review were intentionally limited in scope to those that appeared most appropriate for NIJ consideration. The fact that a specific prevention approach does not appear in this document does not mean that it is not worthy of implementation, research or evaluation. Rather, it may be omitted solely because it does not "fit" the parameters set for consideration in developing a plan for NIJ. While the NIJ staff provided a great deal of insight and information to this effort, the final decision of what to include and what to exclude was made by the author. This document is one outcome from that initiative, and the specific parameters for the discussion appear in the following pages.

In developing this more strategic view of crime prevention, certain parameters need to be established, lest the discussion ramble too freely and the ideas be lost to the vagaries of "crime prevention includes everything". Thus, in developing a list of important issues/topics that crime prevention research and evaluation should pursue, a number of issues need to be addressed at the outset. Among these issues are 1) establishing a working definition of crime prevention, 2) placing some parameters on what types of issues to include, and 3) addressing the appropriate research design for determining what works in crime prevention. After addressing each of these

topics, this paper will outline the approach used in this project for gathering information on crime prevention topics, how the topics were collapsed into working categories, and the specific issues or topics suggested for research/evaluation. On a cautionary note, this paper does not purport to be a complete enumeration of potential crime prevention topics. Instead, it represents a first step in making crime prevention a centralizing/rallying theme for criminal justice research and evaluation.

### **DEFINING CRIME PREVENTION**

Several different definitions for crime prevention have been offered in the literature. Many of the older, more traditional definitions fall into what can be referred to as the “crime control” mentality. It can be argued that such definitions allow for the simple management of the level, location or type of crime. They do not necessarily address the elimination or reduction of crime, nor do they consider related issues such as the public’s fear of crime or peoples’ perceptions of crime.

More recent definitions of crime prevention tend to take a broader approach which address both the reduction of crime and problems related to crime. Thus, the definition used in this document is:

crime prevention entails any action designed to reduce the actual and perceived level of crime and/or the perceived fear of crime

The use of this definition expands the goals of prevention beyond simple crime control to reducing the actual level of crime. It also targets perceptions of the crime problem, fear of crime, and related factors that may contribute to those perceptions and fear. The definition allows the recognition that the quality of life can be negatively impacted by people’s perceptions, regardless

of whether those perceptions and beliefs have a basis in fact or not. Crime prevention, therefore, encompasses a wide range of activities that seek to deal with crime and the consequences of crime. Virtually anything which has the potential for reducing crime, fear and related issues can be considered crime prevention. Certainly, almost anything that agents of social control do falls under the crime prevention rubric.

While this definition of crime prevention recognizes the great breadth of the problem at hand, it excludes almost nothing! Indeed, virtually anything which could potentially impact the level of actual crime, peoples' perceptions of the crime problem, or individual's feelings of safety and fear can be considered as prevention. Prevention can range from the most general community awareness programs at one extreme to individually targeted rehabilitation initiatives at the other. Unfortunately, any definition which includes *everything* imaginable is not as useful as one which is more narrow in scope. Some things fitting the definition must be targeted, while others must be excluded.

### **PARAMETERS FOR THE DISCUSSION**

The current project sought to identify a select subset of prevention initiatives and activities for examination. Several decisions were made in an attempt to pare down the realm of possible prevention initiatives for consideration. First, the project excludes any programs or initiatives which directly target work with adjudicated offenders, or offenders who have begun processing through the formal criminal justice system (so called "tertiary prevention", see Brantingham and Faust, 1976). Thus, activities which generally fall under the rubric of treatment and rehabilitation are not considered. This included initiatives which seek to divert offenders to non-custodial interventions, innovative variations on formal justice system

operations (such as drug-courts), and programs which involve enhancing existing justice system procedures (such as intensive supervision probation or boot camp programs). This is not to suggest that these are not valuable programs worthy of consideration and study. Rather, they generally receive a great deal of attention under other headings.

Second, also excluded are a wide range of other problems and issues which receive significant attention in other forums. One prime example of this is the exclusion of most interventions addressing drug use and abuse. A plethora of materials and projects devote significant time, attention and resources to the problems of drug use, abuse, interdiction, treatment, and interventions. At the same time, drugs and drug use are not totally ignored in this project. Programs which target the onset of youthful drug use and peer pressure to use drugs are considered as potential prevention targets. Especially noteworthy are school-based drug prevention programs. Several reasons were identified for including these types of drug prevention programs and excluding others—the emphasis is on preventing the initial use of drugs (a form of “primary prevention”), the drug use/abuse is a known risk factor for other offending and community problems (i.e. “secondary prevention”), and many of these programs have the potential for addressing multiple problems besides just drug use.

Another group of behaviors not specifically addressed in this project is domestic violence. Clearly, domestic violence, whether directed at spouses, co-habitants, children, siblings or other related individuals, is a major problem that deserves a great deal of attention. As with drug issues, domestic violence receives a great deal of individualized attention and an entire literature and research agenda is active in this area. Another reason domestic violence is excluded from this crime prevention review is the fact that there are significantly different



underlying causes and factors involved in domestic violence from those addressed within the realm of crime prevention (see Doerner and Lab, 2002). This is best illustrated by the fact that “crime prevention” typically addresses property or property-related offenses (such as theft, vandalism and robbery) which involve strangers or acquaintances. Personal crimes that appear as altercations taking place in public places (such as bars) between non-family members are also key targets for many crime prevention discussions. On the other hand, domestic violence more often takes place in the privacy of the home and reflects causal factors that may be tied more closely to the interpersonal relations between family members and intimates. Thus, while prevention of domestic violence is important, it is not the same as most actions typically addressed under the heading of “crime prevention.” This does not mean that factors involved in family violence are totally ignored in this project. Many prevention initiatives, such as mediation and dispute resolution programs, whether in the workplace, the school or the general public, may have an impact in the home. Thus, while the issues identified here do not directly address domestic violence, they will have some relevance for addressing intimate violence.

At the same time that the discussion excludes some topics which receive a great deal of attention from other sources, it does address several issues that permeate many governmental and private initiatives. Three examples of this deal with schools, the police, and developmental programs. First, there are many programs dealing with schools and the educational system while also addressing crime programs. These projects target crime and victimization at school, and they seek to intervene in problematic behavior which takes place beyond the confines of the school building. Thus, a wide array of programs and initiatives in schools that fit within the realm of crime prevention which are included in this discussion. Second, it can be argued that

the very basis of all law enforcement is the prevention of crime. At the same time, this discussion cannot address the myriad of law enforcement activities which receive a great deal of attention in multiple forums. Consequently, this report considers some law enforcement initiatives (particularly the newer partnership activities) while ignoring a great deal of research on other topics (such as response time and patrol operations). Finally, recent work on developmental prevention is leading to a range of unique interventions across a wide range of agencies and disciplines. This report offers some insight to developmental prevention, but does not attempt to provide a detailed review of this growing area.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

At the same time that the project excludes some topics, there is a tacit recognition that a wide array of research designs and approaches can be used in assessing prevention initiatives. *The project does not advocate any one approach to research and evaluation over other approaches.* The recent calls for the almost exclusive use of randomized experimental designs fail to recognize that a great deal of important insight and information can be gained through the use of other research approaches.

A prime example of the insight and value of alternative methodologies appears in the study of burglary. In a review of target hardening efforts, Eck (1979) claims that “more rigorous evaluations” using experimental designs are necessary to adequately assess the impact of such devices on offending. This claim is based on the fact that there exist few studies of target hardening using experimental or quasi-experimental designs. Eck’s review, however, ignores the numerous, independent ethnographic and case studies which show that the use of locks, lights, concealment and other physical barriers are a major factor in the choice of targets by burglars

(see, for example, Bennett and Wright, 1984; Cromwell et al., 1991; Wright and Decker, 1994). While no single ethnographic study can prove the importance of these factors in burglary, the plethora of studies finding the same thing in different settings, using different methodologies and different cross-sections of offenders should not be ignored. If we buy into the argument that we can only learn from experimental design, the valuable information we have on burglary should be totally ignored.

A similar problem emerges in large scale evaluations of community-wide anti-crime partnerships which are not well suited to experimental design. There are obstacles to randomly assigning cities to experimental and control groups, making certain that the control cities do not take *any* actions, or keeping all things constant except for the partnership initiatives, among other things. Consequently, partnerships must be evaluated using alternative methodologies, particularly case studies, surveys and single group pre-test post-test designs. Under the criteria proposed by Sherman et al. (1997), partnership initiatives could never be deemed successful because their evaluations do not use an experimental design.

The results of some past reviews of the crime prevention literature (most notably, Sherman et al., 1997) can be summarized fairly succinctly: We do not know very much for certain. A lay person reading these reports, hoping to learn what can be done to prevent crime, can easily come away either dejected or depressed, or both. This state of affairs is not unusual for social science and should not signal that we should give up. Indeed, Sherman et al. (1997) call for increased research and investigation. Other examinations of the crime prevention literature (Rosenbaum et al., 1998; Lab, 2000; Clarke, 1997) offer insight that many initiatives do work and many hold promise. A major factor distinguishing these different reports is that the

more promising reviews tend to be more inclusive and consider evaluations which utilize a range of different methodologies. What is needed is evaluations which utilize the most appropriate and rigorous methodologies that the context, unit of analysis and data allow (basically what Pawson and Tilley (1997) refer to as “realistic evaluation”). In essence, further investigations must utilize a variety of approaches and techniques.

In the present report, the assessment of prevention efficacy rests on an examination of the entire body of evidence, regardless of the research approach utilized in the analysis. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs, case studies, ethnographic analyses, pre-post evaluations, and other research are all considered. What is needed is to use the research/evaluation design which is most appropriate for the problem being studied and the location/conditions facing the analysis.

This report does not select materials for inclusion based on a single research design, a rigid rating system or set criteria. Instead, the decision to include specific research and information in this report rests upon the answer to several questions. First, does the argument underlying the analysis make sound theoretical sense? Is the expected outcome a reasonable expectation given the situation and causal mechanisms outlined in the theory? Second, is the methodological approach appropriate for the questions being asked or the program being evaluated? Where experimental or quasi-experimental designs are possible, are they used and are they appropriately carried out? Where such designs are not possible, is the chosen research approach an appropriate alternative given the data and the question, and is the analysis carried out correctly? Is the statistical analysis of the data done appropriately? Third, has the researcher placed the project and the results into context? Does the analysis indicate the degree to which

the results are context specific, or has the author sufficiently demonstrated the generalizability of the results across contexts? Finally, is there corroborating evidence for the results? Is this the only study on this topic? Are there conflicting results within the study or across replications? Where more than one study or analysis exists, is there an overriding conclusion that can be drawn, or is there a lack of consensus? The results reported in this document reflect the assessment of our crime prevention knowledge based on the combined answers to these questions.

## **RESEARCH APPROACH**

Several activities were undertaken in identifying the unresolved issues to include in this report. First, information on what research is currently being funded in the area of crime prevention was collected. A search was conducted on funded research by both governmental agencies (mainly federal) and private organizations, primarily through on-line searches of funding activities and publications since the mid-1990s. Among the agencies/organizations included in the search process were the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Community Oriented Policing Services Office, the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the Department of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, the W.T. Grant Foundation, the Police Executive Research Foundation, the Police Foundation, the National Crime Prevention Council, the American Society for Industrial Security, the British Home Office (and its subsidiary portfolio groups), the Institute for Behavioral Science (the “Blueprints for Violence Prevention” series), and others.

A second major initiative was to talk with over 100 experts involved in crime prevention research or the implementation of crime prevention programs (interviews took place March-August 2001). These individuals included both academics and practitioners. A concerted effort was made to contact not only people known for their participation in the traditional realm of crime prevention, but also others who work on prevention issues but who may not identify themselves under that heading. For example, people working on gang issues, school interventions, police activities, and others were asked for their perspective on prevention activities. These discussions were held at several universities and conferences, both in the United States and Great Britain. Many individuals who could not be met in person were interviewed by phone or were asked to provide written input to the project. Throughout the discussions, three major questions/issues were probed: 1) What crime prevention programs/activities do we know enough about that we do not need to undertake further study?; 2) What crime prevention issues/topics/programs should we focus on over the next 5 years?; and 3) How should we be addressing those future needs (i.e. what methods or approaches)? Few people addressed the first of these questions, preferring instead to focus on what we should do in the future and how we should go about those projects.

The final major source of information used in identifying issues needing to be addressed was existing literature on crime prevention. For this endeavor, published books and articles, reports from past funding initiatives, governmental publications, and other sources were collected and examined for insight. While emphasis was placed on materials produced since 1990, the entire endeavor rests on prevention knowledge appearing in printed materials since the

early 1970s. The final list of unresolved issues is a result of combining this information with that from the funding search and interviews.

### **WHERE ARE WE, AND WHERE SHOULD WE GO?**

The balance of this report reflects findings based on the extant literature, interviews and discussions held on the state of crime prevention research. *This is not an attempt to provide a comprehensive presentation of the state of the evidence on crime prevention research and evaluation.* Most of that information is found in the existing literature and work that has already been done (see, Crime Prevention Studies series; Lah, 2000; Rosenbaum et al, 1998; Sherman et al., 1997). It need not be repeated here. Instead, this material outlines the general state of knowledge on various crime prevention topics and approaches, and points out gaps in knowledge that should be addressed. At the outset, one clear fact is evident: *There is much we do not know with any certainty, and much that needs further evaluation and research.* Indeed, there are many prevention initiatives that have been subjected to little, if any, research or evaluation. The topics and issues included in this document were chosen for a variety of reasons. Many of them are long-standing crime prevention topics which remain unresolved. Others reflect topics/issues that several experts in the field or the literature suggests for examination. As in any field that is undergoing constant evaluation and change, there is no consensus on what crime prevention topics are most important or which one deserves the most attention. The issues that are presented below, however, are those that emerge with regularity in both the literature and in discussions with both researchers and practitioners. Similarly, the order in which the topics are discussed has no bearing on the relative value of the topic or the need for examination.

Throughout the discussion, various “Issues” are highlighted which point out key concerns or topics that should be addressed in future research.

### **CATEGORIZING THE CRIME PREVENTION ISSUES**

In order to provide some organization to this discussion, it is necessary to categorize the various prevention initiatives. Several different systems are presented in the literature for organizing the myriad of prevention programs into meaningful categories. One of the earliest frameworks borrows from public health and groups interventions into “primary”, “secondary” and “tertiary” prevention (Brantingham and Faust, 1976). While this approach is useful for a general understanding of prevention issues, many initiatives transcend more than one category. Tonry and Farrington (1995) suggest categories of community, developmental and situational prevention. These categories, however, tend to be overly broad, with many different types of prevention falling under each of the headings. A more recent attempt to group prevention activities is Clarke and Homel’s (1997) matrix of situational prevention initiatives. The authors offer 16 situational crime prevention techniques falling under the categories of Increasing Perceived Effort, Increasing Perceived Risks, Reducing Anticipated Rewards, and Inducing Guilt or Shame. While this typology attempts to provide more specificity to the type (mechanism) of prevention, many prevention programs fall within more than one category, and some writers note that the matrix is not comprehensive and some activities fall outside the matrix.

A similar situation often emerges when a single prevention program is examined. Consider “community crime prevention”. A vast array of different activities fall under this banner. Physical design changes, community policing activities, citizen patrols, neighborhood watch, and newsletters are only a few of the individual initiatives that have appeared under the



general heading of community crime prevention. Thus, any attempt to place community crime prevention into a single category of prevention initiatives will invariably result in debate over the appropriate fit for an intervention.

Despite the problems and pitfalls of categorizing crime prevention activities, there is a need to use some organizing framework to drive this discussion. The framework used in this plan was developed out of a “grounded theory” approach (see, Glaser and Strauss, 1967). That is, the categorization emerged from the examination of the past and present crime prevention programming and research, discussions with experts in the field, and logical connections between crime prevention activities. Many of the prevention topics appearing below could fit under more than one heading. The intent of the categories, however, is solely to provide a framework for discussing prevention initiatives. There is no intent to “pigeon hole” prevention programs into any particular area. These headings are not mutually exclusive, and the individual activities listed under one heading may contribute to or be instrumental for the activities listed under another heading. Indeed, other researchers may feel more comfortable with different groupings.

### **PHYSICAL DESIGN/ACCESS CONTROL EFFORTS**

Suggestions for altering the physical design characteristics of buildings represent the advent of modern “crime prevention.” The work of Jane Jacobs and Oscar Newman in the 1960s and 1970s presaged the growth of crime prevention over the past 30 years. Their interest centered on the architectural design characteristics of buildings and communities, and led to the focus on Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) in the 1970s. Since that time, physical design has grown to encompass a wide range of related issues, including building

design, street layout/traffic patterns, window placement, alarms, neighborhood improvement, security screens, motion sensors, property identification, and many others. The primary focus of these many activities is to make it physically more difficult for offenders to commit crimes and to increase the risk to offenders of being seen in the process of offending.

Physical design factors have been subjected to numerous evaluations which show varying degrees of success or failure. Most of the major work in this area, however, dates back 20-30 years. That is not to say that physical design efforts have been ignored in recent years. The more contemporary analyses tend to appear in discussions of “situational prevention” where a very specific problem appearing in a specific location is addressed (see, Clarke, 1992, for examples). In these more recent studies emphasizing situational prevention, the physical design issues may be so targeted or localized that the question of generalizability of the outcome can be a concern.

In general, many physical design factors have been found to impact crime and/or fear of crime. Locking doors, adding locks, making property look occupied, improving the ability to observe what is happening, adding alarms, and similar actions have been found to reduce offending in various analyses. Ethnographic studies of burglars and other offenders provide some of the strongest support for the influence of these efforts on the selection of targets/victims (see, for example, Bennett and Wright, 1984; Cromwell et al., 1991). Some physical design efforts receive little support. General building design (a la Newman) has a questionable impact on crime and fear. While some studies show reduced levels of crime (such as the Kirkholt project in England- Forrester et al., 1990), others do not find any great impact. The reason for this failure is not altogether clear, although one reason may be the failure of redesign efforts to

actually change the (surveillance) behavior of residents and potential offenders (Kirkholt combined major physical design efforts with neighborhood watch). More recent writings on physical design tend to emphasize the “how to” aspects of design— that is, what changes to make, who to involve in making the changes, etc. (see, for example, Smith, 1996). There is a lack of outcome evaluation on the impact of these efforts.

***ISSUE:** Renewed efforts are needed to investigate the impact of physical design changes and to understand the mechanisms causing the changes.*

One early design change which received attention was improved street lighting. Early research in the United States using official crime data found little impact on crime. More recent research in the United Kingdom, however, suggests a much greater impact of lighting on crime when measuring crime by victimization data (see, Painter and Farrington, 1999). From the standpoint of residents in both the U.S. and U.K., lighting has an almost uniform impact on reducing the reported fear of crime.

***ISSUE:** Would new studies of lighting in the U.S. which use self-reported victimization data uncover similar results to those in recent U.K. analyses?*

The use of closed-circuit television (CCTV) is an emerging technology receiving attention in both the U.S. and abroad. CCTV has received a great deal of attention in the UK, but only minimal interest in the US, except for use in businesses. Much of the work on CCTV has focused more on the acceptance of such technology by the public than on its impact on crime. What research does exist suggests that such surveillance activity does reduce offending, although a great deal of additional research is needed. Indeed, the British Home Office in 2001 awarded over \$2.25 million to undertake a national evaluation of CCTV. Recent developments

in the area of face recognition technology suggest that CCTV may be a useful tool to combat illegal entry into the U.S., as well as terrorism. Surveillance technologies also have applications in homes, schools, hospitals, shopping centers, and many other locales. Besides the hoped for deterrent effect, this technology is useful in the identification and prosecution of offenders. Unfortunately, there is little empirical study of the impact of these devices on crime and victimization.

*ISSUE: The relative lack of use of CCTV in the U.S. allows for the establishment of good controlled experiments for testing the effectiveness of this technology.*

One community design characteristic which has been evaluated in recent years involves efforts to alter the traffic patterns in problem areas. This idea can be traced to several early CPTED studies, particularly the work in the North Asylum Hill area of Hartford, CT (see, Fowler et al., 1979). More recently, efforts were undertaken in Los Angeles to close off streets in a high crime/violence neighborhood (Lasley, 1996). The evaluation revealed significant declines in offending in the target area relative to other areas. The results held for both personal and property crime, and suggest that the redesign of traffic flow is a viable option, at least in high crime areas.

*ISSUE: Can altered traffic patterns be implemented on a wider scale and in different neighborhoods with the same positive impact on crime?*

At the same time, various physical design prevention techniques have received little research attention, or have not been considered in a way that allows research to isolate the individual impact of the actions. Good examples of these are property identification activities, fences, the use of unbreakable glass, and the issuance of personal identification to control the

access of outsiders. Each of these appear in various prevention suggestions, but have not been adequately tested.

One unfortunate problem in many of the evaluations of physical design changes lies in the fact that many of these efforts are undertaking a very broad package of initiatives, which makes it difficult to adequately uncover the effectiveness of the activities. Certainly, it becomes almost impossible to isolate the relative impact of the different prevention actions. At the same time, if a positive change is found, replication becomes difficult unless you are willing to undertake the entire package. If the next community or neighborhood opts not to use the entire package, or simply cannot do so, there is no way to adequately predict whether the intervention will work in the new location, and that assumes that the neighborhoods are equal on all other factors— a poor assumption in many cases. The fact that conflicting evidence shows up in the past evaluations of these broad-based prevention packages should not be surprising when it is clear that the interventions are often quite different across the studies (as are the neighborhoods).

*ISSUE: Can meaningful evaluations of individual design approaches be successful, or are they so intertwined that they must be considered as a package?*

An important qualifier to a great deal of this research is the fact that many of the reductions or changes are limited to the individual homes/locations which undertake the design changes. That is, only those homes which use locks and alarms experience reduced victimization. The remaining homes on the same block often experience no changes in offending. When the research looks for changes in the burglary rate for the neighborhood and finds no change in the overall level of crime, the assumption is that the intervention had no impact. The reality, however, may be that the changes were very successful at protecting the

individual homes. Meanwhile, there may be a degree of displacement to surrounding homes which are not enhanced (that is, there is target displacement). The unfortunate result of this is the claim that such physical design changes have little impact. This is certainly the case where the evaluation tries to use an experimental design with neighborhoods as the unit of analysis. The neighborhood crime rates may not change, but there is significant changes for those within the neighborhood. The issue of displacement is currently being investigated under NIJ auspices, but the results of that project are not yet available.

*ISSUE: Displacement, in all its forms, should be assessed in all evaluations where economically feasible. Where it is not possible to evaluate displacement, the authors need to note the potential of the different forms of displacement as a limitation in the evaluation.*

The rise in interest in situational prevention, particularly over the past 10 years in the United States, has renewed interest in physical design changes for crime prevention. In this approach, however, the changes are typically tied to a specific location or problem. For example, the problem of phone toll theft in New York's Grand Central Station prompted the removal or relocation of many pay phones as a means of preventing offenders from stealing the access codes of legitimate users (see Felson et al., 1996). Similarly, theft from vehicles in a parking deck was mitigated by installing fencing and limiting access into the deck (see, Poyner, 1991). In many other studies, very targeted interventions have been shown to reduce the level of specific crime problems (see, Crime Prevention Studies series). By definition, however, such situational prevention techniques are not automatically transferable to other locations or crime

problems. While they may be generalizable, it will not be known how generalizable until they are applied to other locations and problems.

*ISSUE: Despite the limited generalizability of most individual situational prevention projects, continued evaluations of such initiatives will provide valuable insight to prevention.*

## **NEIGHBORHOOD MOBILIZATION**

Prevention programs have long attempted to address the problems of crime and fear by mobilizing the residents of an area. While certainly not new to the 1970s, the growth of neighborhood watch closely followed the physical design efforts which assumed that the change in the physical structure would alter the behavior of residents and others in the area. The failure to find such a connection, however, prompted many individuals and programs to emphasize interventions that directly worked to build resident participation and action. The underlying assumption was that such mobilization would enhance the level of (informal) surveillance in neighborhoods and the community.

Most of the early mobilization took the form of neighborhood watch programs which incorporated a wide range of disparate activities. Clearly, surveillance was a cornerstone of these efforts. Other common activities included property identification markings, conducting home security surveys, improved physical design (e.g. street lighting, area beautification), crime hotlines, citizen patrols, and others (see, Garofalo and McLeod, 1988). As with physical design activities, many of the individual initiatives have not undergone individual evaluation. Perhaps the best example is security surveys which appear as an option in almost all neighborhood group

initiatives. Interestingly, there has never been a single published paper reporting on the impact of such surveys.

Unfortunately, empirical evidence on the effectiveness of these early neighborhood mobilization projects is very uneven. While there are studies which show reductions in crime and fear as a consequence of such group activity (see, for example, Anderton, 1985; Cook and Rochl, 1983; Forrester et al., 1988; Laycock and Tilley, 1995; Latessa and Travis, 1987), there are also many analyses which fail to find any clear impact of these projects (see, for example, Bennett, 1990; Lewis et al., 1988; Rasmussen et al., 1979). The reasons for this contradictory evidence is not entirely clear, although Rosenbaum (1987) points out several problematic assumptions underlying the basic assumptions of neighborhood mobilization. In general, his argument points to the fact that organizing a significant percent of a neighborhood's residents into a meaningful collective which can effectively identify problems and solutions is a very difficult task. This is highlighted by the fact that neighborhoods that need the help the most are typically the hardest to organize. The failure of many programs, therefore, may be in the inability to build a meaningful indigenous coalition.

*ISSUE: How do you identify and successfully recruit indigenous leaders and coalitions in high crime and disorderly communities?*

Despite the questionable support for neighborhood mobilization, such efforts have not disappeared. On the contrary, neighborhood mobilization continues to flourish in a variety of settings. Perhaps the most noticeable recent efforts are the community anti-drug initiatives of the 1990s. What makes those activities especially noteworthy is the fact that many of the successful programs appeared in the same kinds of neighborhoods which previously could not build anti-



crime cooperatives. These neighborhood anti-drug activities typically report reductions in crime and increased feelings of empowerment by residents (see, Davis et al., 1991; Davis and Lurigio, 1996; Popkin et al., 1999; Rosenbaum et al., 1997).

*ISSUE: What accounts for the success of community anti-drug initiatives in the same types of communities that previously were unable to successfully undertake anti-crime initiatives?*

*ISSUE: Why is it so hard to organize anti-crime initiatives but easier to engender anti-drug groups?*

What factors make for a successful organizing effort and successful program? The literature is replete with discussions of who participates and why (see, Lab, 2000), as well as attempts to explain the differences from study to study (Lavrakas and Lewis, 1980; Lab, 1990; Hope and Lab, 2001). And while several factors have been offered as explanations and some have been the subject of investigation, the answers to these questions have not been adequately addressed in past work. As a result of these unanswered questions, it is not known why neighborhood mobilization works in one place and time and not in another. There is evidence, however, that such mobilization can work.

*ISSUE: A great deal of attention needs to be paid to uncovering how to engender citizen participation, and the implications of those actions on crime and fear.*

## **PARTNERSHIPS FOR CRIME PREVENTION**

In recent years, the tendency has been to take the idea of neighborhood mobilization to a higher level and focus on a broader set of participants. These initiatives attempt to build strong partnerships which include a myriad of agencies and individuals, including indigenous

neighborhood leaders, local, state and federal law enforcement, legislators, local and federal prosecutors, housing authorities, members of the faith community, planners, public works personnel, and many others. Among the most recognizable of these partnerships is Weed and Seed, the Comprehensive Communities Program, the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI), and Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), in the United States, and the Safer Cities Program and the Crime and Disorder initiatives, in the United Kingdom.

Most of these partnership projects have received a great deal of attention and significant funds have been spent evaluating the programs. Unfortunately, most of the research involves process evaluations, with little attention paid to outcomes of the initiatives. The Comprehensive Communities Program, for example, was recently evaluated in sites across the United States (Kelling et al., 1999). Without exception, the evaluation spent a great deal of time describing the activities of each program, particularly the coalition building activities at each site. At the same time, however, there is relatively little emphasis on outcome measures in the report. Where outcome measures are considered, the approach is primarily qualitative and it is difficult to assess whether the program had any significant or direct impact on the overall crime rates or fear of crime. Similar process evaluations have been undertaken in the various SACSI and PSN sites, and relatively little emphasis has been placed on assessing the programs' impact on crime. There is currently some attempt to undertake outcome assessments in some SACSI and PSN sites, although it is unclear to what extent the evaluations will be successful at carrying out the evaluations. One clear finding in these process studies is the fact that building meaningful coalitions is extremely difficult and time consuming.

The passage of the U.K. Crime and Disorder Act in 1998 mandated the establishment of community partnerships to combat crime and related problems. These partnerships were meant to include the local police and a variety of community constituents, including housing authorities, victims, health professionals, probation, and others. A key component of the act was that each partnership is to carry out a crime audit every three years, based on data for the prior three years. Information should come from a variety of sources, such as police statistics, victimization surveys, probation data, education, and environmental health. The police are mandated to consult with the community in a partnership arrangement and use this data to form prevention strategies and evaluate those strategies (Walklate, 1999). With the advent of the program in 1998, outcome evaluations based on the Crime and Disorder Act mandates have yet to be completed. Despite this, several authors point out that some attempts to form partnerships have met with less than full success, the police are often the major contributor to the process, and the exact role of the participants is often poorly outlined (see, for example, Hughes, 2000; Tierney, 2001). The problems identified by these authors are similar to those found in earlier analyses of partnership initiatives. Also, a good deal of the published work about the Crime and Disorder Act has examined the politics surrounding the Act and the development of crime audits (data collection for planning purposes). Unfortunately, research on the impact of the interventions has not been completed (see, Crime Prevention and Community Safety, Vol. , 2002). Consequently, it is unclear to what extent these new partnerships will lead to significant changes in crime and disorder.

*ISSUE: Outcome evaluations on crime and fear should be a part of all partnership assessments.*

The U.K. Safer Cities program proposed similar coalition building as a means of reducing crime and fear. Each individual program received extensive funding and support from the central government to establish multi-agency partnerships for fighting social, physical and economic problems in urban areas. Key participants in the partnerships were the police and representatives of various community agencies and groups. As with the U.S. initiatives, evaluations of the Safer Cities Program have shown some mixed success. In some communities there were clear reductions in crime (Ekblom et al., 1996; Tilley and Webb, 1994). At the same time, there was clear evidence of displacement into surrounding neighborhoods not included in the prevention activities. Additionally, many areas were simply written off as lost causes by the coalitions (Sutton, 1996), meaning that the successes appeared in neighborhoods where the problems were not as acute and the need not as great. The areas that needed the help the most were not addressed!

While moving to outcome evaluations of partnership projects are desirable, additional research is also needed on several aspects of implementing partnership projects. Indeed, when outcome evaluations are attempted, they often highlight implementation issues. For example, the Weed and Seed program has been the subject of outcome evaluations in eight different communities across the United States (see, Dunworth et al., 1999). Under Weed and Seed, areas are targeted for heavy police action in an attempt to weed out the crime and other problems before the program moves on to seeding the area with programs and initiatives that inhibit the return of the problems. The results present contradictory evidence on the ability of such partnerships to reduce crime and change people's perceptions of their communities. While crime was reduced in some communities, it was unchanged in others and many of the changes were

only marginal improvements when compared to control areas (Dunworth et al., 1999). The reasons provided for the conflicting results generally revolve around the finding that the seeding activities are extremely hard to accomplish and often fail to materialize due to the inability of the different partners to agree on the proper seeding activities (Dunworth and Mills, 1999; Tien and Rich, 1994). The results, therefore, call into question the ability to establish meaningful and workable partnerships. At the same time, the national evaluation of the Comprehensive Communities Program provides some insight into successfully building partnerships (Kelling et al., 1999). The findings from that process evaluation need to be repeated in additional locations and with programs that do not receive the intensive (financial and technical) assistance provided in the targeted Comprehensive Community sites.

*ISSUE: What factors are essential to building a successful coalition/partnership, that is, one which is able to identify and implement agreed upon programming?*

Building partnerships to fight crime, disorder and fear has also been attempted in public housing (see, for example, Mazerolle et al., 1998; Popkin et al., 1995; Thurman et al., 1998). These efforts face some of the same problems as those attempted in high crime neighborhoods, including getting residents to participate, identifying leaders, and making long-term changes. While some initiatives have had some successes (such as project ROAR in Spokane, WA), others have had less than impressive results. The impact of the programs in public housing on crime and fear also has been uneven, with some programs demonstrating success and others failing to show positive outcomes, despite what appears to be similar levels of effort and approaches.

*ISSUE: What are the key factors underlying success and failure across studies in public housing, and how do you replicate those findings from place to place?*

Partnerships also appear under the general heading of community-oriented policing (COP). In its truest sense, COP is supposed to be a cooperative effort to fight crime and related problems between the police and the community which they serve. Under COP, the police are supposed to be leaders in bringing together the diverse talents and efforts of the entire community in an attempt to identify problems, solutions to those problems, and the proper methods and personnel to implement the solutions. In Hoover's (1992) terms, the police become *community managers*. The emphasis is to be problem solving through whatever means is the most appropriate. This may mean that the police will play a minimal role in implementing many prevention programs, often because the imposition of the criminal code is not the most effective solution to the problem. The greatest participation of the police may be simply bringing the proper people together to solve the problem. At other times, the police under COP may be integral to the solution of some problems.

Despite the great amount of money and effort put into promoting COP, many police departments do little to actually include the public and other agencies in the problem solving activities. This does not mean that some police departments are not attempting to build true partnerships through COP. The Chicago Alternative Police Strategy (CAPS) is a good example of successfully implementing a community-oriented policing approach. The CAPS program actively sought to build interaction between beat officers and neighborhood residents in order to better identify problems in the neighborhoods and potential solutions to those problems (Hartnett and Skogan, 1999). An evaluation of the CAPS program reveals numerous indicators of success, ranging from reduced drug problems to improved physical conditions in neighborhoods to increased surveillance by residents (Hartnett and Skogan, 1999). Unfortunately, this one good

example is an exceptional case amid many others where COP is little more than a means to hire more officers and build good public relations.

One of the reasons for this state of affairs is the fact that COP programs rarely undergo any form of rigorous evaluation. At best, evaluations tend to be process evaluations which look at the number of COP officers hired and put on the street, or the assignment of officers to “community” or neighborhood offices or beats, thus making them community police officers! Most evaluations fail to assess the degree of problem solving taking place, the number and breadth of community members or agencies being involved in the problem identification and problem solving, or the changes in crime, fear or disorder related to the problem solving efforts. The outcome is clearly inconsequential to the claim the COP is being done.

Those evaluations of true attempts at implementing COP fair no better than most studies of community partnerships. Evidence does exist that the police can build cooperative partnerships with citizens and other agencies, but when outcome evaluations are completed, the results are typically modest. Some studies show reductions in crime, while others do not. Many of the claims for the efficacy of community policing come out of specific initiatives targeted at specific problems, places and times (i.e. situational prevention approaches) in which the police play a noticeable role. While these studies suggest that community policing is viable for reducing crime, they do not deal with the impact of community policing over the entire community or for the general crime rate in an area. Two recent analyses (Zhao et al., 2002, 2003) suggest that COPS has had some impact on levels of arrest and crime using city-level data, but it is not clear what community policing activities actually brought about the changes, or if the results can be replicated.

***ISSUE: Community-oriented policing needs to be evaluated in terms of its impact on crime and fear, and root causes of crime in communities.***

***ISSUE: Community perceptions of disorder, fear, quality of life, crime prevention, and other outcomes need to be systematically evaluated in relation to the community-policing and partnership initiatives.***

## **SCHOOL-BASED PREVENTION**

Schools have become a central focus for many prevention initiatives. These initiatives actually address two related concerns—the level of crime and fear in school, and the impact of school programs on the level of crime and fear in the general community. While not mutually exclusive, many programs target one or the other location, with a tacit assumption that any change in behavior in one place will spill over to other locations and times. Unfortunately, many of the school programs have not been adequately evaluated.

### **Programs Targeting In-School Problems**

A variety of initiatives attempt to address crime and fear that occurs in school, including anti-bullying programs, behavior management, zero tolerance policies, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program, school resource officers, alternative schools/classrooms, and altering the general school atmosphere. Anti-bullying programs have received some of the most intense interest in recent years due to the mass killings at several schools. These interventions attempt to train teachers, administrators and students to recognize bullying behavior and how to respond in a socially responsible way. Despite the popularity of this idea, relatively few evaluations of the approach have been conducted, although the existing studies provide strong support for the efficacy of such programs (Olweus, 1994,



1995). In a similar fashion, behavior management of various forms has been used to identify problems and intervene in appropriate ways. Again, the general finding is that behavior management can be successful at addressing in-school problems (see, Gottfredson, 1997). The results are qualified, however, by the fact that many initiatives do not bring about uniform results across school settings. Programs may work in one setting, but fail in another, and many outcomes are measured only in the short term and focus on in-school behavior. What is not known is the operant factors which dictate when and where a specific program works.

*ISSUE: A great deal of additional work is needed to know when, where and under what conditions different behavior management approaches will work.*

The U.S. Department of Education has initiated two programs in recent years aimed at dealing with crime and other problem issues for youths. These are the Safe and Drug Free Schools program and the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative. While driven by legislative mandates, the two programs incorporate a wide range of different interventions. Much of the diversity rests on the decisions of the different school districts, who they include in the planning of programs (e.g. parents, police, etc.), and what programs they decide to implement. The programs have provided a great deal of funding and had a major impact on programming in schools. Along with other agencies (including the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention), the Department of Education has undertaken various evaluations under these programs. Unfortunately, the research have been focused primarily in two areas— measuring the extent of victimization and fear in schools, and process evaluations of the implementation of programs. Relatively little comprehensive outcome evaluation has been conducted.

***ISSUE:** Like many community partnership projects, there is a great deal that needs done on the impact of such comprehensive school programs on crime and fear.*

One program that is growing in popularity is the School Resource Officer program. While placing officers in schools is not a new idea, there has been a growing desire to base officers in schools, particularly in light of recent school shootings. A good example of this growth is the fact that the Community-Oriented Policing Office has targeted funding at departments which are looking to assign officers to school duty. The School Resource Officer program is currently undergoing both a process and an outcome evaluation.

Another approach to eliminating crime and fear in schools is to change the overall environment in the school. Changing the environment could range from turning the school into a very custodial, controlled facility to a quasi-community where everyone develops a stake in the outcome by participating in making most decision and implementing those plans. It is the latter of these two extremes that is viewed as the most promising approach. Indeed, there is some evidence that such activities can lead to reduced crime and fear in schools (see, for example, Gottfredson, 1986; Kenney and Watson, 1998; Lab and Clark, 1996; Welsh, 2001). It is from this perspective that arguments are made to maintain some initiatives, despite the fact that they have been shown to have minimal impact (for example, DARE or student conflict mediation). The idea is that, while individual programs may fail, the combination of interventions, which involve a wide range of individuals and ideas, will have a greater combined impact on the school. The various parts contribute to an altered environment conducive to reduced crime and fear. In some respects, the more global programs of the Department of Education (e.g. Safe and Drug Free Schools) sow the seeds for such participatory activity.

*ISSUE: There is a need to evaluate the contribution of varying individual efforts, such as DARE and GREAT, to an altered school environment and, subsequently evaluate the impact of the environment on crime and fear in the school.*

### **School Programs Targeting Community Problems**

Many school initiatives target community problems, either simultaneously with in-school concerns or simply aimed at problems outside the school. Among those activities are truancy reduction programs, after-school activities, preschool programs, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), and other educational programs. Some of these programs have received intensive evaluation, while others have received little attention.

Resistance Skills Training. Both DARE and GREAT have been the subject of major evaluations. These programs take a similar approach to their respective target problems. Each involves some form of resistance skills training, in which students are taught how to recognize various problems and issues, how to deal with peer pressure, building self-esteem, and how to appropriately respond to problems. These lessons are taught by police officers in hour long class sessions over roughly ten weeks. The evidence on each program is not overwhelming. For DARE, the research is almost uniform in its finding that drug use is not impacted by participation in the program (Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Rosenbaum and Hansen, 1998). GREAT has not fared much better when it comes to altering ganging behavior (see, Esbensen et al., 2001). Both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of GREAT find an impact on improved attitudes of students toward pro-social peers and the police, and more negative views toward

gangs (Esbensen and Osgood, 1999; Esbensen et al., 2001). Both DARE and GREAT are currently undergoing revision in an attempt to make them more effective.

*ISSUE: The revised curricula should be examined and possibly subjected to new outcome evaluations.*

Many other programs have attempted to educate youths about delinquent and criminal behavior. Resistance skills training has been used in many programs aimed at stopping the use of drugs, alcohol and other substances, such as tobacco. Studies of such programs targeting alcohol, tobacco and marijuana use show that such an approach may have some short-term impact, particularly on tobacco use (see, for example, Botvin, 1990; Botvin and Dusenbury, 1989). A similar lack of definitive positive results have been found in other resistance skills initiatives.

Truancy Reduction. Truancy reduction programs have received increased attention in recent years in many jurisdictions. Many of these efforts involve a combination of picking up truant youths and returning them to school (or taking them into custody) and holding parents accountable for their truant children. Two underlying issues drive most of these efforts. First, removing truants from the street eliminates any offenses those youths might have committed while out of school. The school provides supervision, thereby reducing the level of crime during the school day. Second, reducing truancy should lead to increased educational attainment and higher graduation rates. This should lead to greater chances of (meaningful) employment and fewer chances of turning to crime in the future. Clearly, the arguments underlying such initiatives make sense and easily lead to anti-truancy initiatives. The impact of such programs on crime (both current and long-term), however, is unknown. Most truancy reduction programs rely

on process evaluations which count the number of youths handled and the methods used to dispose of the cases.

***ISSUE:** Truancy reduction programs need to be assessed for their impact on crime.*

**After-School Programs.** Another recent movement has been to establish after-school programs for youths. As with other programs, these efforts have multi-faceted goals. Perhaps the most common argument underlying these initiatives is that keeping youths busy and supervised after school mitigates the possibility of them getting into trouble. Indeed, there is clear evidence that youthful offending peaks in the late afternoon and early evening, particularly on school days, with roughly 20% of all juvenile violent crime occurring on school days between three and seven o'clock (OJJDP, 1999). Therefore, projects that can keep juveniles busy after school hold the potential of reducing the level of crime in the community. This same argument underlies the calls for mid-night basketball leagues and other initiatives that occupy unsupervised free time. A secondary argument used to support many after-school programs reflects the belief that educationally-based programs can increase the academic achievement of participating youths. Interestingly, despite the great interest in these kinds of interventions, there has been almost no evaluation conducted. Most of the existing literature focuses on what these programs look like and how to initiate one, rather than on whether they are successful at achieving their intended mission. This holds true for both crime and educational outcomes.

***ISSUE:** Outcome evaluations are needed which assess the impact of after-school programs on crime and victimization.*

**Preschool Programs.** One school-based intervention which has received a great deal of evaluation work is preschool programs. Most notable among these is the Perry Preschool/High

Scope project and Head Start. These projects posit that at-risk youths need early and intensive assistance to overcome the disadvantages they face at home and in entering school, and to build a positive attitude toward school. Without such assistance, many of these youths are destined to do poorly in school, drop out, become delinquent, and rely on public assistance throughout their lives. Evaluations of preschool programs generally show a positive impact on educational attainment, particularly in the short term (see, for example, Gottfredson, 1987; Schweinhart et al., 1993). Longer-term impacts are more uncertain and may require further work beyond the preschool years. Of greater concern for crime prevention is the ability of youths in these programs to avoid criminal behavior in the future. On this point, the results are not as consistent. Research on the Perry Preschool youths seem to indicate reduced levels of criminal activity and criminal justice system involvement lasting into the young adult ages, compared to control group subjects (Schweinhart et al., 1993). Most other studies of preschool programs fail to look for any impact on later crime and delinquency.

*ISSUE: While the results are promising, additional work is needed on programs other than the Perry Preschool project.*

## **PREVENTION PROGRAMS FOR BUSINESSES**

Businesses face unique crime problems when compared to the average citizen, and those problems are in addition to many of the issues faced by everyone else. They are the subjects of burglary, vandalism, theft, and robbery like others in society. What makes their situation unique is the fact that many businesses invite the public into their establishments (often with minimal supervision) and offer a range of valuable targets for potential offenders, ranging from merchandise on the shelf to cash in the drawer. There is also the threat of violence against

underlying causes and factors involved in domestic violence from those addressed within the realm of crime prevention (see Doerner and Lab, 2002). This is best illustrated by the fact that “crime prevention” typically addresses property or property-related offenses (such as theft, vandalism and robbery) which involve strangers or acquaintances. Personal crimes that appear as altercations taking place in public places (such as bars) between non-family members are also key targets for many crime prevention discussions. On the other hand, domestic violence more often takes place in the privacy of the home and reflects causal factors that may be tied more closely to the interpersonal relations between family members and intimates. Thus, while prevention of domestic violence is important, it is not the same as most actions typically addressed under the heading of “crime prevention.” This does not mean that factors involved in family violence are totally ignored in this project. Many prevention initiatives, such as mediation and dispute resolution programs, whether in the workplace, the school or the general public, may have an impact in the home. Thus, while the issues identified here do not directly address domestic violence, they will have some relevance for addressing intimate violence.

At the same time that the discussion excludes some topics which receive a great deal of attention from other sources, it does address several issues that permeate many governmental and private initiatives. Three examples of this deal with schools, the police, and developmental programs. First, there are many programs dealing with schools and the educational system while also addressing crime programs. These projects target crime and victimization at school, and they seek to intervene in problematic behavior which takes place beyond the confines of the school building. Thus, a wide array of programs and initiatives in schools that fit within the realm of crime prevention which are included in this discussion. Second, it can be argued that

exist, however, tend to show that many of these techniques, particularly those dealing with theft and fraud, are successful (see, for example, Gill, 1994, 1998).

While there has been some work on business theft and fraud, there has been almost no evaluative work done on interventions aimed at workplace violence. The literature in this field talks about how to spot potential problems, how to screen employees, how to respond to a situation after it has occurred, and the legal ramifications for the employer. The reasons for this lack of outcome evaluation are easy to identify. First, the cases of workplace violence are very rare, despite the primacy that such occurrences have in the media. Consequently, evaluating the impact of an intervention to stop a rare event is extremely difficult. Second, academic concern about workplace violence is relatively new (not surprising given the rarity of the event). There simply has not been much attention paid to the phenomenon. What research has been undertaken tends to be *ex post facto* studies of the events and focus on why the individual did the act, rather than on how to stop future events.

*ISSUE: There is a need to move research on workplace violence into outcome assessments of intervention programs.*

Other prevention activities dealing with businesses have been undertaken. Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are a form of neighborhood watch established by business owners. These organizations may undertake a number of prevention activities similar to those found in residential neighborhoods, but it is also common for BIDs to self-impose additional “taxes” on their members. These funds are then used to pay for private security, increased police coverage, business promotion, and area improvement. While common in some areas, not all businesses and areas have the ability to pay for extra services or the time to join together in such



consortiums. There have been some concerns that **BIDs** may displace crime to non-businesses and businesses that do not participate. Beyond **BID's**, businesses in various communities have become important partners in community policing, partnerships, and other crime prevention activities. The role and impact of these activities have received little attention in terms of its impact on crime, fear or the quality of life in the neighborhoods.

***ISSUE:** Do **BIDs** have a negative impact on non-participating businesses and the surrounding community?*

***ISSUE:** How and in what ways has the inclusion of businesses in partnerships and crime prevention initiatives impacted on crime, fear and the quality of life in the communities?*

One unique way that businesses can participate in the prevention of crimes in the larger community is through restricting the sale of various products. Examples of such endeavors would be restricting the sale of certain glues or solvents that youths might use as inhalants, or withholding the sale of spray paint as a means of cutting down on the level of graffiti in an area. By setting sales policies like these, businesses can have an impact on a variety of community problems. While these types of actions are not new, there is no strong evidence that these efforts have been successful. The evidence that does exist is anecdotal, at best. The fact that these actions continue to be undertaken in different communities suggests that an evaluation of this approach is warranted.

## **INDIVIDUAL PREVENTION ACTIVITIES**

### **Avoidance Behavior**

One common prevention approach adopted by many people is simple avoidance behavior (see, Lab, 1990; Hope and Lab, 2001). While avoidance may reduce potential harm, it has two

unfortunate side effects. First, it limits the freedom of the individual to fully take part in society. Second, it isolates people from one another and turns the community over to those who are brave enough to venture outdoors (often the offenders). Besides abandoning the larger society, avoidance can lead to negative personal consequences, such as death from locking one's self into a hot home. Despite these negatives, avoidance can reduce victimization, the risk of victimization, and the fear of crime. Indeed, avoidance is advocated by various people and organizations (such as universities) as a protective mechanism. While advocated by many, avoidance has received little direct attention in the evaluation literature. It typically appears in discussions of what people do to protect themselves or in discussions of fear of crime.

***ISSUE:** Who uses avoidance behaviors, and to what extent do they impact crime and fear?*

## **Escorts**

An alternative to avoidance behavior is the use of escorts. This approach can be found on many college campuses as a formalized mechanism for students to use when moving around campus, particularly at night. Most often these "escort services" rely on volunteers to walk students and staff from place to place on campus, although it can also involve the use of motorized transport. Escorts also appear when individuals make arrangements for going out with a known and trusted companion, or notifying a family member, neighbor or friend to watch for you when you are coming or going from home or another location. Escorts are also used to protect elementary and secondary school students on their way to and from school (see, NCPC, 2001).

***ISSUE:** Who uses escort programs, and to what extent do these programs impact the levels of crime and fear?*

### **Self-defense Training**

Self-defense training is another prevention approach used by some individuals (Hope and Lab, 2001). The idea is to teach individuals how to physically, and sometimes verbally, defend themselves when confronted by an offender. This is often seen in discussions of rape and sexual assault, and is again common on many college campuses. Self-defense training may also entail simple instruction on how to be aware of one's surroundings, how to attract attention or call for help, and how to escape a threatening situation. Such training is often available from local law enforcement. Despite the popularity of self-defense training, its usefulness for preventing crime has not been documented. Most literature takes a "how to" approach, rather than demonstrating its prevention effectiveness. Further, in terms of sexual assault, there are some who argue that taking physical action may lead to greater harm to the victim.

***ISSUE:** Does self-defense training reduce the level of harm to potential victims?*

## **COMMUNITY INITIATIVES**

### **Curfews**

A popular approach to curbing crime in the community has been the imposition of nighttime curfews. The popularity of curfews is evident by the fact that more than three-quarters of the cities with a population over 100,000 had a curfew in effect in 1996 (Maguire and Pastore, 1997). Curfews rest on the recognition that most offending is committed by younger individuals, many of whom are legally juveniles. The assumption is that, by limiting the movement of youths, the level of offending will be curtailed. An important oversight, however, is the fact that

most juvenile offending occurs in the hours immediately after school and in the early evening, not late at night and in the early morning hours which are those covered by most curfews. The typical curfews, therefore, can be expected to have (at best) only a marginal impact on crime in a community. While curfews have become a favored response, rigorous evaluation of curfews is missing.

*ISSUE: Rigorous evaluation of the impact of curfews on crime needs to be conducted.*

### **Civil Remedies**

The failure of the police and the usual imposition of the criminal code to solve various problems has led some communities to try using civil remedies. Perhaps the best example recent example of this approach is Oakland's use of the civil court to attack the drug problem. Using Specialized Multi-Agency Response Teams (SMART) which call on the participation of the police, prosecutor, health department, zoning office and other resources, Oakland has targeted properties being used in the drug trade. Under the program, landlords are contacted by the police and are encouraged to deal with problem tenants (often through eviction proceedings) and to take control of their property. Landlords who refuse to participate may be fined, have their buildings boarded up, or be subjected to constant scrutiny by the health department and other agencies until, ultimately, the jurisdiction takes civil court action against the owner. This approach has been used in several jurisdictions and research has shown that it can be an effective method for dealing with problem buildings (see, Mazerolle and Roehl, 1998). Generally these actions mirror some of the themes underlying community policing, in particular marshaling the participation of other agencies and groups in the activities. While most of the discussion of such civil abatement actions has revolved around drug issues, Roehl et al. (1996) discuss the possibility of civil

remedies for other problems. Unfortunately, there are no outcome evaluations available that address other crime problems.

***ISSUE:** To what extent can civil remedies reduce or eliminate targeted problems besides drug use and abuse?*

### **Incivilities**

The idea of dealing with crime producing situations, such as drug houses, is exemplified in the ideas of incivilities and disorder. The argument, as proposed by Wilson and Kelling (1982), is that crime flourishes in communities and areas which are being left to decay and appear to be abandoned by the owners or law abiding citizens. These areas are viewed as abandoned and safe places for offenders to frequent. The study of disorder and incivility has been a key part of prevention research over the past 20 years. Despite this attention and the amount of lip service paid to the idea, there is no clear consensus on the impact of incivilities on the actual level of crime in a community. There is little doubt that crime occurs in areas that tend to exhibit higher levels of both physical and social incivilities. The unresolved issues, however, are to what extent the crime is a result of the incivilities (or simply a co-occurring problem) and what eliminating the incivilities will do to the actual crime in the area (see, Sampson and Raudenbush, 2001). Taylor (1997) points out that how incivilities are measured (either objectively or subjectively) presents very different results and probably plays a major role in any attempts to deal with crime by altering the level of incivilities. Despite this lack of clarity and empirical proof for a causal relationship, many initiatives continue to target disorder and incivilities.

Attacking incivilities can be accomplished in a wide variety of ways, ranging from very specific issues to community-wide changes. Efforts may involve many of the physical design ideas discussed earlier which may result in beautifying a neighborhood and making it appear that people are actively caring for the area. Certainly, efforts to force land owners and landlords to take care of their property, either through civil actions or other means, is a method for attacking incivilities. Eliminating problem entertainment ventures, such as bars and adult theaters, may eliminate local loitering, public drunkenness and prostitution. Similarly, establishing after-school activities may cut down on the number of youths "hanging out" in the neighborhood. More specific ideas may include the erection of graffiti boards in a community, putting out public trash receptacles, or undertaking community clean-up days. On a larger scale, efforts to entice businesses to locate in the neighborhood and to encourage the building of new homes and buildings may all make a difference. What is not known is the impact on crime and fear.

*ISSUE: What is the relationship between incivilities and crime/fear, and will eliminating area incivilities reduce the level of crime and fear in the area?*

### **Public Education**

Attempts to educate the general public about important issues are made on a daily basis by various organizations and agencies, both in the U.S. and elsewhere. Public service announcements appear regularly on television and radio, as well as in the print media, and target an array of concerns from public health topics to crime problems. Crime prevention has received a great deal of exposure through the "Taking A Bite Out of Crime" media campaign. This series of public service announcements both notified the public about potential problems and about some appropriate responses to the problems. This campaign has undergone two extensive

national evaluations which show that the public retains information conveyed in the announcements and that the material is effective at altering some attitudes and behaviors (O'Keefe and Mendelsohn, 1984; O'Keefe et al., 1996). The evaluations, however, focus primarily on process and are not able to show any impact on overall crime. A second method of educating the public which has been used in many crime prevention efforts is the production of newsletters carrying information on the crime problem and on responses to crime. As with the "Taking A Bite Out of Crime" project, these newsletters have been shown to influence knowledge and attitudes, but no definitive impact on crime has been demonstrated (Lavrakas, 1986). Another emerging education approach is the move by some jurisdictions to make crime data and information about offenders (such as sex offenders' residences) available on-line, often using spread sheets and interactive computer mapping.

***ISSUE:** The potential of using the media to reach a large number of people and influence their beliefs and behavior has been largely untapped in the crime prevention arena. Research and evaluation is needed on the ability of public education initiatives to actually educate the public, reduce fear of crime, increase prevention activities, and improve the perceived quality of life in the communities, as well as compare the relative impact of different forms of public education in bringing about these changes.*

### **Mentoring Programs**

The development of mentoring programs represents a prevention initiative which relies on the involvement of individuals, working one-on-one with at-risk youths. As with many programs, mentoring is not a new idea, and it appears under a variety of titles, the most well known of which is Big Brothers/Big Sisters. Some of these initiatives are tied to the juvenile

court, while others may be based in other community organizations or agencies. These programs seek to provide youths with role models who can help guide their charges in making appropriate choices and wise decisions. Youths are supposed to call on the mentors for advice and help, while the mentors are supposed to be non-judgmental. While a great number of these programs exist, few have been subjected to rigorous evaluation. The Big Brothers/Big Sisters program, however, has undergone evaluation and is considered a model program which effectively reduces the level of drug use, alcohol use, and aggressive behavior (McGill, 1997). Novotney et al. (2000) report on a process evaluation of an OJJDP funded study of mentoring programs across the U.S. An outcome evaluation is forthcoming.

*ISSUE: Besides the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program, are other mentoring programs effective at dealing with youthful misconduct and long-term individual achievement?*

#### **Mediation/Dispute Resolution/Restorative Justice Programs**

The idea of trying to find satisfactory resolutions to disputes between two parties, whether they be clearly identified victims and offenders or not, is not new. This movement received renewed interest in the 1970s and quickly expanded and changed to take on a number of different forms. In essence, each permutation has relied on the same basic principles of trying to make all parties to an event or dispute active participants in the resolution of the issue, and try to resolve the factors underlying the event. The most recent incarnation of that attempt is “restorative justice”, which more intimately involves the formal agents of the criminal justice system than some of its predecessors. Under restorative justice, the victim, the offender, families and friends of the victim and offender, and criminal justice system personnel are all included in finding a way to “restore” things to the way they were before the criminal act. Participation in



these “conferences” is generally voluntary and all parties must agree to participate and abide by the final decisions. While restorative justice addresses victim needs, many people feel that participation in these activities can have a rehabilitative effect on the offender.

The growth of these programs, however, has far surpassed the level of outcome evaluation which has been conducted. Indeed, most analyses focus on the process of mediation and restorative justice (see, for example, LeBoeuf and Delany-Shabazz, 1997). One recent exception is an evaluation of this approach in Bethlehem, PA, where participants reported satisfaction with the process but there was no impact on the number of juvenile arrests (McCold and Wachtel, 1998). Braithwaite (2002) reviews the literature on restorative justice programs and notes that most evaluations rely on the perceptions of participants as the measure of success. Using that criteria, the programs are generally judged to be successful, although most such evaluations are based only on those cases where all parties agree to participate, which could skew the results. The limited evidence on recidivism provides mixed results (Braithwaite, 2002; Sherman et al. 2000).

*ISSUE: Mediation/restorative justice needs to undergo rigorous outcome evaluations to determine under what circumstances it is effective for reducing recidivism.*

## **FEAR OF CRIME**

Fear of crime continues to be a major component of many prevention initiatives. There is no dispute that people report being fearful to a much greater extent than they report (either officially or unofficially) being a victim of crime. In addition, people respond to that fear in a variety of ways, many of which are either physically or socially debilitating, for themselves or for their community. People avoid certain places or events, lock themselves into their homes,

demand greater police activity, buy locks, guns, dogs or other (supposed) protective devices, or make themselves physically sick (such as with high blood pressure), all as a consequence of the fear of crime. Staying home or avoiding certain places can result in lost sales to businesses, the abandonment of community centers and public parks, increased feelings of isolation in the neighborhood, and similar negative community outcomes. Whatever the response, it is indicative of fear's impact on the individual and society.

The level of fear has remained relatively constant over time, although the specifics of the fear may change. Periodic surveys by the National Crime Prevention Council (see, for example, <http://www.ncpc.org/rwesafe3.htm>) and other agencies and groups show that fear varies by both time and place. In recent years, fear of going to school has increased for some youths due to the mass killings which have taken place. Most recently, fear of flying has had debilitating effects on both fliers and airlines as a result of the terrorist acts in New York and Washington. While these catastrophic events engender specific forms of fear, fear remains a constant for many people in their everyday lives. What this means is that fear of crime is a legitimate target of prevention efforts in its own right.

Many of the prevention initiatives which have emerged over the past 30+ years (and discussed earlier) contain efforts to address fear along with preventing actual crime. Too often, however, fear is a secondary concern for those projects. As a result, there is still a great deal that is not known about fear, particularly in terms of its prevention. Most research targeted at fear has focused on the proper means of measuring fear (see, Ferraro, 1995). Unresolved issues include the identification of when fear is healthy (i.e. it serves a good purpose for the individual or community) and at what level is that "healthy" fear reached. Another important factor which

needs to be considered is whether fear can be successfully used as a motivating tool for preventive action. Perhaps a more important issue is how can society rid people of unreasonable fear (i.e. fear that exceeds what should exist given objective reality).

***ISSUE:** Both basic and applied research needs to be undertaken to better understand fear, its benefits, and its prevention.*

## **DEVELOPMENTAL PREVENTION**

Interest in predicting which youths will become delinquent, or which delinquents will continue on to adult criminality has a long history in criminology. Tonry and Farrington (1995) identified developmental prevention as one key form of prevention activity. The key to developmental prevention is the successful identification of risk factors which promote or predict future delinquency or criminality. The idea is to identify those variables/factors which indicate a higher likelihood for an individual to become a problem. Once those risk factors have been identified, preventive interventions can be used to ameliorate those conditions or factors before the deviance becomes manifest. Loeber and Farrington (1998) provide an excellent review of what is known about risk factors. They also present several discussions on past attempts to intervene in various risk factors related to serious and violent juvenile offending. While some of the discussions are applicable to preventing initial delinquency/criminality, most of the materials relate to those youths who have already established a pattern of serious and violent behavior.

There is little need for basic research into uncovering the risk factors for delinquency and criminality. This does not mean that additional risk factors could yet be uncovered. Rather, it means that existing knowledge on risk factors need to be put to work. One avenue for investigation is to understand the dynamics behind risk factors and deviant behavior. The

Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods will provide excellent insight to risk factors and behavior. Additional work is also needed to better understand the impact of risk factors, both in isolation and in conjunction with one another. A second line of attack is to implement interventions which specifically target a risk factor (or group of risk factors) and undertake assessments on the impact on later deviance. Numerous large scale intervention projects have been undertaken (see, for example, Harrell et al., 1999; McDonald and Howard, 1998; Reynolds et al., 2001) and many of the chapters in the Loeber and Farrington (1998) book discuss interventions. Many target outcomes besides delinquency and criminal behavior and, while these alternative outcomes may be (directly or indirectly) connected to deviant behavior, it is important to specifically design evaluations which measure delinquency and criminal behavior as an outcome. Projects that do attempt to assess the impact on crime and delinquency tend to find reductions in deviant behavior, particularly during project participation. Long-term follow-ups have yet to be completed.

*ISSUE: Concerted attention is needed to continue developing prevention programs which seek to mitigate the effect of the wide range of risk factors related to delinquent and criminal behavior.*

## **FIREARMS CONTROL**

Due to the increased level of violence using firearms in the 1990s, and fueled by several mass school shootings, there has been a strong call to do something about the availability of firearms, especially for youths. Projects in this area typically rely heavily on the police to crack down on the availability and use of firearms in an area through aggressive order maintenance activities, such as stop and frisk activities, breaking up loitering, consistent police presence, and

other actions meant to make it difficult to commit crimes with impunity. While other agencies/groups may be involved in the intervention, most of the participants tend to be employees of the criminal justice system, including prosecutors, probation, federal agencies, and correctional alternatives. Operation Ceasefire in Boston (see, Braga et al., 2001) and the hot spot work in Jersey City, New Jersey (Braga et al., 1999) provide good examples of this approach. Boiled down to its core, this approach is basically an attempt at deterrence. The projects hope to deter the level of firearm violence by increasing the certainty that individuals will be caught and prosecuted (see, Sheppard et al., 2000, for a clear depiction of this argument in action). These programs typically require a concerted concentration of police manpower and resources over an extended period of time. There is some evidence that this approach is effective at reducing the level of firearm violence, although the results are not uniform across all studies and areas (see, Braga et al, 2001; Dunworth, 2000; McGarrell et al., 2001). It is important to note that relatively few of these interventions have been evaluated.

***ISSUE:** Can the successes of existing firearm reduction/enforcement projects be replicated on a broader scale in more jurisdictions, and what is the key mechanism(s) for the success of these efforts?*

### **ANTI-GANG PROGRAMS**

The problem of gangs and gang behavior is certainly not new, and the number of attempts to prevent ganging and related criminal activity is large. In one respect, belonging to a gang could be considered a risk factor for drug and alcohol use and other criminal behavior. As such, the ability to intervene in gangs would hold the potential of mitigating these other problem activities, and fit nicely under the prevention banner. In some jurisdictions, belonging to a gang

has itself been criminalized and is a legitimate target in its own right for prevention initiatives. Attempts to break up gangs, intervene in gang activities, keep youths from joining gangs, or otherwise interrupt the influence of gangs appear throughout the literature over the past 40 years. In addition, many of the prevention ideas expressed early in this report have been used in connection with gangs or gang problems, either explicitly (as in the GREAT program) or implicitly (such as in firearms control programs, curfews, neighborhood mobilization or partnership initiatives). Intervention with gangs can also be considered under a strict law enforcement, rehabilitation or correctional heading, particularly if the emphasis is on arrest or other form of suppression.

Unfortunately, various forms of suppression have been the most common approach used when dealing with gangs (Spergel and Curry, 1993), and true prevention interventions have been rare. The most notable recent exception to this has been the use of educational programs in schools which seek to provide youths with information and skills useful in resisting the lure of gangs and the peer pressure to join gangs (such as the GREAT program). As noted earlier, research on the GREAT program fails to show any significant impact on gang membership between experimental and control groups, although there appear to be some modest impact on attitudes and other behaviors, although most are not statistically significant (Esbensen et al., 2001). Most remaining interventions focus on prevention of crime committed by gangs or gang members and many of those evaluations fail to find any significant impacts.

*ISSUE: Continuing efforts need to be made to develop and evaluate programs which prevent youths from joining gangs.*

## **REPEAT VICTIMIZATION**

Repeat victimization is a topic which has received relatively little attention in the U.S. but has a great deal of potential for crime prevention. Repeat victimization refers to instances where the same individuals or locations experience more than one victimization event within a relatively short period of time. British researchers have found that repeat victimization is not an uncommon event (see, for example, Bowers et al., 1998; Ellingworth et al., 1995; Pease, 1998). Taking repeat victimization beyond the specific individual or location, Pease (1998) argues that some victimizations are the result of offenders copying their activities at similar locations. For example, an offender who successfully robs a convenience store may purposefully target another store from the same chain with the same or similar layout because of that similarity. Thus, this is a “virtual repeat” (Pease, 1998).

Repeat victimization becomes an important topic for crime prevention because of its potential to inform interventions and responses. Targeting prevention activities to crime victims has the potential of reducing subsequent victimizations and, to the extent that a past victimization increases the chance for another victimization, the preventive intervention has a greater potential of success. This approach was specifically taken in the Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Program in the U.K. Working directly with burglary victims, the program was successful at reducing the level of repeat victimization among those participating (Pease, 1998). Targeting crime victims and locations provides specific information on how to intervene, such as changing the ease of entry and securing certain types of valuables (Ratcliffe and McCullagh, 1999). An important finding of past studies on repeat victimization shows that the similarity in offenses declines over time. This suggests that interventions need to be undertaken in near proximity to the original

victimization to have the greatest impact. Despite these findings, research in repeat victimization is relatively new and most of the work has been done in the U.K.

*ISSUE: Increased research on repeat victimization is needed, and its value for crime prevention needs to be ascertained.*

## SUMMARY

A wide range of issues/topics can be subsumed under the heading of “crime prevention”. In developing a more strategic view of crime prevention, certain parameters need to be established, lest the discussion ramble too freely and the ideas be lost to the vagaries of “crime prevention includes everything”. Unfortunately, any definition which includes *everything* imaginable is not as useful as one which is more narrow in scope. Some things fitting the definition must be targeted, while others must be excluded. Most of the issues identified in this report are typically addressed by a myriad of agencies under a vast array of headings and themes. This state of affairs often does disservice to many of the problems and potential solutions by allowing many important issues to slip through the cracks unnoticed or relegated to secondary status of little concern to the agency or program. Even more problematic is the fact that many important topics identified as “crime prevention” are ignored because “crime prevention” is not recognized as the central issue or purview of any one agency. It is simply a secondary concern to be addressed when it fits nicely with other topics.

There is a clear need for undertaking comprehensive research and evaluation on a wide range of crime prevention approaches. Indeed, the establishment of an agenda for “Crime Prevention” research and evaluation is sorely needed in the United States. Funding for such evaluation should be based on the promise of different initiatives. Factors that would point to



supporting research and evaluation include the soundness of the theory underlying the project, clarity of the purpose of the program, past evidence of effectiveness of the intervention in different contexts, and/or existing research on related topics and issues. While the ultimate goal of the evaluation should be to demonstrate the effectiveness of the project at reducing crime and/or fear of crime (an outcome evaluation), there also should be an examination of how well the program was implemented, the level (or dosage) of the intervention delivered and the extent to which the program reached the appropriate target (a process evaluation).

Research and evaluation of crime prevention programs also need to utilize a range of methodologies based on the type of program, the availability of data and the underlying rationale for the program. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs, intensive case studies, simple pre-test post-test designs, ethnographies, survey designs and others all need to be considered when approaching different projects. No single evaluation approach will be appropriate for all questions and contexts. In all cases, replication of the results over multiple analyses and contexts is necessary in order to claim a causal relationship between the intervention and changes in crime and fear.

The issues identified here demonstrate that many topics easily fit under the heading of crime prevention, and many of them are ripe for further research and evaluation. While there is no need to place all of these issues/topics into a single agency or research agenda, it is vitally important that they be enumerated (as done here) and addressed by someone. The failure to examine these issues will result in wider gaps in our knowledge, as well as unresolved crime problems for citizens to face.

## REFERENCES

- Anderton, K.J. (1985) *The Effectiveness of Home Watch Schemes in Cheshire*. Chester, Eng.: Cheshire Constabulary.
- Bennett, T. (1990) *Evaluating Neighborhood Watch*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Bennett, T. and R. Wright (1984) *Burglars on Burglary*. Brookfield, Vt.: Gower.
- Botvin, G.J. (1990) "Substance abuse prevention: Theory, practice and effectiveness." in Tonry, M. and J.Q. Wilson, eds., *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Botvin, G.J. and L. Dusenbury (1989) "Substance abuse prevention and the promotion of competence." in Bond, L.A. and B.E. Compas, eds., *Primary Prevention and Promotion in the Schools*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bowers, K.J., A. Hirschfield and S.D. Johnson (1998) "Victimization revisited: A case study of non-residential repeat burglary on Merseyside." *British Journal of Criminology* 38:429-452.
- Braga, A.M., D.M. Kennedy, E.J. Waring and A.M. Phiel (2001) "Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38:195-225.
- Braga, A.M., D.L. Weisburd, E.J. Waring, L.G. Mazcrolle, W. Spelman and F. Gajewski (1999) "Problem-oriented policing in violent crime places: A randomized controlled experiment." *Criminology* 37:541-580.
- Braithwaite, J. (2002) *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation*. Oxford, ENG: Oxford University Press.
- Brantingham, P.J. and F.L. Faust (1976) "A conceptual model of crime prevention." *Crime and Delinquency* 22:284-296.
- Clarke, R.V. (1992) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. Albany, NY: Harrow and Heston.
- Clarke, R.V. (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Albany, NY: Harrow and Heston.
- Clarke, R.V. and R. Homel (1997) "A revised classification of situational crime prevention techniques." In Lab, S.P. (ed.), *Crime Prevention at a Crossroads*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

- Cook, R.F. and J.A. Rochl (1983) **Preventing Crime and Arson: A Review of Community-Based Strategies**. Reston, Va.: Institute for Social Analysis.
- Crime Prevention Studies, series edited by R.V. Clarke. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Cromwell, P.F., J.N. Olson and D.W. Avary (1991) **Breaking and Entering: An Ethnographic Analysis of Burglary**. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Davis, R.C. and A.J. Lurigio (1996) **Fighting Back: Neighborhood Antidrug Strategies**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, R.C., B.E. Smith, A.J. Lurigio and W.G. Skogan (1991) **Community Response to Crack: Grassroots Anti-Drug Programs**. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Doerner, W.G. and S.P. Lab (2002) **Victimology**. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Dunworth, T. (2000) **National Evaluation of the Youth Firearms Violence Initiative**. NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Dunworth, T. and G. Mills (1999) **National Evaluation of Weed and Seed**. NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Dunworth, T., G. Mills, G. Cordner and J. Green (1999) **National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Cross-site Analysis**. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Eckblom, P., H. Law and M. Sutton (1996) **Domestic Burglary Schemes in the Safer Cities Programme**. Research Findings No. 42. London, ENG: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- Ellingworth, D., G. Farrell and K. Pease (1995) "A victim is a victim is a victim?: Chronic victimization in four sweeps of the British Crime Survey." *British Journal of Criminology* 35:360-365.
- Esbensen, F. and D.W. Osgood (1999) "Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.): Results from the national evaluation." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36:194-225.
- Esbensen, F., D.W. Osgood, T.J. Taylor, D. Peterson and A. Freng (2001) "How great is G.R.E.A.T.?: Results from a longitudinal quasi-experimental design." *Criminology and Public Policy* 1:87-118.
- Felson, M., M.E. Belanger, G.M. Bichler, C.D. Bruzinske, G.S. Campbell, C.L. Fried, K.C. Grofik, I.S. Mazur, A.B. O'Regan, P.J. Sweeney, A.L. Ullman and L.M. Williams (1996)

- "Redesigning hell: Preventing crime and disorder at the port authority bus terminal." In Clarke, R.V. (ed.) *Preventing Mass Transit Crime*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Ferraro, K.F. (1995) *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Forrester, D.H., M.R. Chatterton and K. Pease (1988) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Demonstration Project*. Home Office Crime Prevention Paper no. 13. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Forrester, D.H., S. Frenz, M. O'Connell and K. Pease (1990) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project: Phase II*. London, ENG: Home Office.
- Fowler, F., M.E. McCalla and T.W. Mangione (1979) *Reducing Residential Crime and Fear: The Hartford Neighborhood Crime Prevention Program*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Garofalo, J. and M. McLeod (1988) *Improving the Use and Effectiveness of Neighborhood Watch Programs*. NIJ Research in Action. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Gill, M. (1994) *Crime at Work: Studies in Security and Crime Prevention*. Leicester, ENG: Perpetuity Press.
- Gill, M. (1998) *Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders*. Leicester, ENG: Perpetuity Press.
- Glaser, B.G. and A.L. Strauss (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine.
- Gottfredson, D.C. (1986) "An empirical test of school-based environmental and individual interventions to reduce the risk of delinquent behavior." *Criminology* 24:705-731.
- Gottfredson, D.C. (1987) "Examining the potential of delinquency prevention through alternative education." *Today's Delinquent* 6:87-100.
- Gottfredson, D.C. (1997) "School-based Crime Prevention." In Sherman, L.W., D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter and S. Bushway (eds.) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Harrell, A., S. Shannon and S. Sridharan (1999) *Evaluation of the Children at Risk Program: Results 1 Year After the End of the Program*. NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

- Hartnett, S.M. and W.G. Skogan (1999) "Community policing: Chicago's experience." *National Institute of Justice Journal* (April):3-11.
- Hoover, L.T. (1992) "Police mission: An era of debate." In Hoover, L.T. (ed.), *Police Management: Issues and Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Hope, T. and S.P. Lab (2001) "Variation in crime prevention participation: Evidence from the British Crime Survey." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal* 3(1):7-22.
- Huges, G. (2000) "In the shadow of crime and disorder: The contested politics of community safety in Britain." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal* 4(2):47-60.
- Kelling, G.L., S.K. Costello, M.R. Hochberg, A.M. Rocheleau, D.P. Rosenbaum, J.A. Roth, W.G. Skogan and W.H. Sousa (1999) *Cross-site Analysis of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program*. Cambridge, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corp.
- Kenney, D.J. and T.S. Watson (1998) *Crime in the Schools: Reducing Fear and Disorder with Student Problem Solving*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Lab, S.P. (1990) "Citizen crime prevention: Domains and participation." *Justice Quarterly* 7:467-492.
- Lab, S.P. (2000) *Crime Prevention: Approaches, Practices and Evaluation*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Lab, S.P. and R.D. Clark (1996) *Discipline, Control and School Crime: Identifying Effective Intervention Strategies*. Final Report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Lasley, J. (1998) 'Designing Out' Gang Homicides and Street Assaults. NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Latessa, E.J. and L.F. Travis (1987) "Citizen crime prevention: Problems and prospectives in reducing crime." *Journal of Security Administration* 10:38-50.
- Lavrakas, P.J. (1986) "Evaluating police-community anticrime newsletters: the Evanston, Houston, and Newark field studies." in Rosenbaum, D.P., ed., *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Lavrakas, P.J. and D.A. Lewis (1980) "The conceptualization and measurement of citizens' crime prevention behaviors." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 17:254-272.
- Laycock, G. and N. Tilley (1995) *Policing and Neighbourhood Watch: Strategic Issues*. London, ENG: Home Office Police Research Group.
- LeBoeuf, D. and R.V. Delany-Shabazz (1997) *Conflict Resolution*. OJJDP Fact Sheet #55. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Lewis, D.A., J.A. Grant and D.P. Rosenbaum (1988) *The Social Construction of Reform*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Univ. Press.
- Loeber, R. and D.P. Farrington (1998) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maguire, K. and A.L. Pastore (1997) *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics- 1996*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Mazerolle, L.G., J. Ready, B. Terrill and F. Gajewski (1998) *Problem-oriented Policing in Public Housing: Final Report of the Jersey City Project*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Mazerolle, L.G. and J. Roehl (1998) "Civil remedies and crime prevention: An introduction." In Mazerolle, L.G. and R. Roehl (eds.) *Civil Remedies and Crime Prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- McCold, P. and B. Wachtel (1998) *Restorative Policing Experiment: The Bethlehem, PA, Police Family Group Counseling Project*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- McDonald, L. and D. Howard (1998) *Families and Schools Together*. OJJDP Fact Sheet #88. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- McGarrell, E.F., S. Chermak, A. Weiss and J. Wilson (2001) "Reducing firearms violence through directed police patrol." *Criminology and Public Policy* 1:119-148.
- McGill, D.E. (1997) *Blueprints for Violence Prevention: Big Brothers Big Sisters of America*. Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.
- National Crime Prevention Council (2001) *Six Safer Cities: On the Crest of the Crime Prevention Wave*. Vol. II. Washington, DC: National Crime Prevention Council.

- Novotney, L.C., E. Mertinko, J. Lange and T.K. Baker (2000) *Juvenile Mentoring Program: A Progress Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1999) *Violence After School*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- O'Keefe, G.J. and H. Mendelsohn (1984) "Taking A Bite Out of Crime": The Impact of a Mass Media Crime Prevention Campaign. Wash., D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- O'Keefe, G.J., D.P. Rosenbaum, P.J. Lavrakas, K. Reid and R.A. Botta (1996) *Taking A Bite Out of Crime: The Impact of the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Media Campaign*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Olweus, D. (1994) "Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines* 35:1171-1190.
- Olweus, D. (1995) "Bullying or peer abuse at school: Facts and intervention." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 4:196-200.
- Painter, K. and D.P. Farrington (1999) "Improved street lighting: Crime reducing effects and cost-benefit analysis." *Security Journal* 12 (forthcoming).
- Pawson, R. and N. Tilley (1997) *Realistic Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pease, K. (1998) *Repeat Victimization: Taking Stock*. London, ENG: Home Office Police Research Group.
- Popkin, S.J., V.E. Gwiasda, D.P. Rosenbaum, A.A. Anderson, L.M. Olson, A.J. Lurigio and N. Taluc (1995) *An Evaluation of the Chicago Housing Authority's Anti-Drug Initiative: A Model of Comprehensive Crime Prevention in Public Housing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Popkin, S.J., V.E. Gwiasda, D.P. Rosenbaum, J.M. Amendolia, W.A. Johnson and L.M. Olson (1999) "Combating crime in public housing: A qualitative and quantitative longitudinal analysis of the Chicago Housing Authority's anti-drug initiative." *Justice Quarterly* 16:519-558.
- Poyner, B. (1991) "Situational crime prevention in two parking facilities." *Security Journal* 2:96-101.

- Rasmussen, M., W. Muggli and C.M. Crabill (1979) Evaluation of the Minneapolis Community Crime Prevention Demonstration. St. Paul: Crime Control Planning Board.
- Ratcliffe, J. and M. McCullagh (1999) "Burglary, victimization and social deprivation." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal* 1:37-46.
- Reynolds, A.J., J.A. Temple, D.L. Robertson and E.A. Mann (2001) "Long-term effects of an early childhood intervention on educational achievement and juvenile arrest." *JAMA* 285:2339-2346.
- Rochl, J.A. H. Wong and C. Andrews (1996) *The Use of Civil Remedies for Neighborhood Crime and Drug Abatement by Community Organizations*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987) "The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: Is it sound fear and crime reduction strategy?" *Crime and Delinquency* 33:103-134.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., A.J. Lurigio and R.C. Davis (1998) *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., R.L. Flewelling, S.L. Bailey, C.L. Ringwalt and D.L. Wilkinson (1994) "Cops in the classroom: A longitudinal evaluation of Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 31:3-31.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. and G.S. Hanson (1998) "Assessing the effects of school-based drug education: A six-year multilevel analysis of project D.A.R.E." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35:381-412.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., P.J. Lavrakas, D.L. Wilkinson and D. Faggiani (1997) *Community Responses to Drug Abuse National Demonstration Program: An Impact Evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Sampson, R.J. and S.W. Raudenbush (2001) *Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods- Does It Lead to Crime?* NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Schweinhart, L.J., H.V. Barnes and D.P. Weikart (1993) *Significant Benefits*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.
- Sheppard, D., H. Grant, W. Rowe and N. Jacobs (2000) *Fighting Juvenile Gun Violence*. OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.



- Sherman, L.W., D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter and S. Bushway (1997) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Sherman, L.W., H. Strang and D. Woods (2000) *Recidivism Patterns in the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE)*. Canberra, AUS: Centre for Restorative Justice, Australian National University.
- Smith, M.S. (1996) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Parking Facilities*. NIJ Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Spergel, I.A. and G.D. Curry (1993) "The national youth gang survey: A research and development process" In A.P. Goldstein and C.R. Huff (eds) *The Gang Intervention Handbook*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Sutton, M. (1996) *Implementing Crime Prevention Schemes in a Multi-agency Setting: Aspects of Process in the Safer Cities Programme*. London, ENG: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- Taylor, R.B. (1997) "Crime, grime and responses to crime: Relative impacts of neighborhood structure, crime, and physical deterioration on residents and business personnel in the twin cities." In Lab, S.P. (ed.), *Crime Prevention at a Crossroads*. Cincinnati: Anderson Pub.
- Thurman, Q., R. Lincoln, J. Atella and M. Massoglia (1998) *Final Outcomes of Project ROAR: A Discussion of Findings and Implications for Future Research*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Tien, J.M. and T.F. Rich (1994) "The Hartford COMPASS program: Experiences with a weed and seed-related program." In Rosenbaum, D.P. (ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, J. (2001) "Audits of crime and disorder: Some lessons from research." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal* 3(2):7-18.
- Tilley, N. and J. Webb (1994) *Burglary Reduction: Findings from Safer Cities Schemes*. London, ENG: Home Office Police Research Group.
- Tonry, M. and D.P. Farrington (1995) "Strategic approaches to crime prevention." In Tonry, M. and D.P. Farrington (eds.) *Building a Safer Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walklate, S. (1999) "Some questions for and about community safety partnerships and crime." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal* 1(3):7-16.

- Welsh, W.N. (2001) "Effects of student and school factors on five measures of school disorder." *Justice Quarterly* 18:911-947.
- Wilson, J.Q. and G. Kelling (1982) "Broken windows." *Atlantic Monthly* (March):29-38.
- Wright, R.T. and S.H. Decker (1994) *Burglars on the Job: Streetlife and Residential Break-ins*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Zhao, J.S., M.C. Scheider and Q. Thurman (2002) "Funding community policing to reduce crime: Have COPS grants made a difference?" *Criminology and Public Policy* 2:7-32.
- Zhao, J.S., M.C. Schcider and Q. Thurman (2003) "A national evaluation of the effect of COPS grants on police productivity (arrests) 1995-1999." *Police Quarterly* 6:387-409.

TABLE 1- MAJOR CRIMES IMPACTED BY PREVENTION TECHNIQUES BY LOCATION

**KEY:** B- burglary R- robbery T- theft A- Agg/Violence V- vandalism  
F- Fear D- drug crimes FR- fraud DI- Disorder/Intiv. gc- Gen. Crime  
green- positive impact; red- no impact; blue- impact varies by project/context;  
white- process evaluation; black- lack of research/evaluation

HOME	PUBLIC HOUSING	BUSINESS	SCHOOL	WORKPLACE	COMMUNITY
------	----------------	----------	--------	-----------	-----------

CPTED						
Traffic Patterns/ street layout	B,T,V,F					B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Lighting	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,V,F	B,V		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
CCTV	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,V,F,FR	B,R,T,A,V,F,D	A,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Informal Surveillance	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D	R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D	A,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Alarms	R,F	B,F	B,R,F	B,F		
Property ID	B,T,F	B,T,F		B,T,F		
Motion Sensors			B	B		
Building Design	B,F	B,R,T,F	B,R,T,V	B,R,T,F		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Security Screens			R,F		A,F	R,A
Unbreakable Glass	B,F	B,F	B,R,F	B,F	A,F	B,F
Area Improvement	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Safes	B		B,R			

NEIGH. WATCH						
Citizen Patrols	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI				B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
NW Groups/Coll. Eff.	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI				B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Comm. Anti-Drug Prog		B,R,T,F,D,DI,gc				B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Security Surveys	B,T,F	B,T,F	B,R,T,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D	R,T,A,F,FR	B,T,F

ACCESS CONTROL						
Guards		B,R,T,A,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F	R,T,A,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Secured/Keyed Doors	B,F	B,T,A,F	R,T	B,T,A,F	B,T,A	
Personal IDs	R,T,A,F,FR	B,R,T,A,F,FR	R,T,FR	R,T,A,F	T,A,F	
Locks	B,V	B,R,T,F	B	B		
Fences	B,R,T,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI		B,R,T,A,V,F		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI

SCHOOLS						
Truancy Programs	B,T,A,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	R,T,V,F			B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
After-school Progs	B,T,A,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	R,T,V,F			B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Anti-bullying Progs				A,gc		A,gc
Competency Building						A,D
Behavior Mgmt				T,A,V,F,D		A,V,F,D,gc
DARE						D
School Atmosphere				F,D		
Preschools						B,R,T,A,V,F,D,gc
Safe&Drug Free Schs.				T,A,F,D,DI		
Zero Tolerance Policy				R,T,A,V,F,D		
SROs				R,T,A,V,F,D		
Alt. Schools/Progs				R,T,A,V,F,D,gc		

**KEY:** B- burglary R- robbery T- theft A- Agg/Violence V- vandalism  
 F- Fear D- drug crimes FR- fraud DI- Disorder/Inciv. gc- Gen. Crime  
 green- positive impact red- no impact blue- impact varies by project/context  
 violet- process evaluation black- lack of research/evaluation

HOME	PUBLIC HOUSING	BUSINESS	SCHOOL	WORKPLACE	COMMUNITY
------	----------------	----------	--------	-----------	-----------

BUSINESS ISSUES						
Property Tagging			R,T			
Inventory Control			B,R,T			
Anti-theft Notices			T			
Package Screening			T			
Check/ID Policies			T,FR			
Return Policies			FR			
Employee Screening			T,A,FR		A,F	
Business Imp. Districts			B,R,T,A,V,FR		A,F	
Theft Proof Items			R,T			
Employee Supervision			T,FR		A,F	
Licensing	FR	FR	FR			FR
Monetary Policies			T,FR			
Staff Training			B,R,T,A,V,FR		A,F	
Restrict Sales of Items		R,V,F,DI	R,V,F	V,F,DI	A,V,F	R,A,V,F,DI

PARTNERSHIPS						
C.O.P.S.		All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Weed and Seed						B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Comp. Communities		All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder
SACSI		All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder

MISCELLANEOUS						
Avoidance		R,A,F				R,A,F
Escorts		R,A,F		R,A,F		R,A,F
Curfews	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,V	B,T,V		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Pub. Edu./Media	B,T,V,F,D,gc	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI,gc
Mentoring						A,D
Lifeskills Training						D
Property Locators	B,T	B,T	B,T	B,T		B,T
Self-Defense		R,T,A,F		R,A,F	R,A,F	R,A,F
Tenant Screening		B,R,T,A,F,D				
Health Inspections		D,DI				D,DI
Mediation/Dispute Resol	B,T	B,T,A,F		T,A,F	A,F	B,T,A,F
Weapons/Firearms Cont.		R,A,F	R,F	R,A,F	A,F	R,A,F
Policy Development		B,R,T,A,F,D,DI	R,T,FR	T,A,F,D	A,F	
Anti-fencing Operations	B,T	B,R,T	B,R,T	B,T		B,R,T
Civil Remedies	D,F,DI	D,F,DI				B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI
Graffiti Boards	V	V	V	V		V
Reduce Incivilities	B,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D	B,R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D		B,R,T,A,V,F,D
Targeted Enforcement	All Crimes/Disorder	All Cr/Disorder	All Cr/Disorder	All Cr/Disorder		All Cr/Disorder
Anti-gang Activities	B,R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI	B,R,T,V,F	B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI		B,R,T,A,V,F,D,DI

TABLE 2- KEY ACTORS IN PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE

KEY: R- residents/citizens I.G- local government P- planners LE- law enforce SA- sch staff/adm EC- entire community  
HO- home owners HA- housing authority A- architects BO- business own ST- students C- courts  
RE- researchers

HOME	PUBLIC HOUSING	BUSINESS	SCHOOL	WORKPLACE	COMMUNITY
------	----------------	----------	--------	-----------	-----------

CPTED						
Traffic Patterns/ street layout	R,L,G,P,LE					R,L,G,P
Lighting	HO	LG,HAP	BO	SA		R,L,G,P,BO
CCTV	HO	R,L,G,HAP	BO	SA	BO	R,L,G,HAP,BO,LE
Informal Surveillance	R,P,A	R,P,A	BO,P,A	SA,ST,P,A	BO,A	R,L,G,P,A,BO
Alarms	R,LE	R,P,A	BO,LE	SA,LE		
Property ID	R,LE	R,H,A,LE	BO,LE	SA,ST		
Motion Sensors			BO,LE	SA,LE		
Building Design	R,A	HA,P,A,LE	BO,P,A,LE	SA,P,A,LE		R,L,G,P,A,BO,LE
Security Screens			BO,A		BO,A	
Unbreakable Glass	R,A	HA,P,A	BO,P,A	SA,P,A		
Area Improvement	R,L,G,P,LE	R,L,G,HAP,LE	BO,P,LE	SA,ST,P,LE		R,L,G,P,A,BO,LE
Safes	R		BO			

NEIGH WATCH						
Citizen Patrols	R,LE	R,H,A,LE				R,LE
NW Groups/Comm. Eff.	R,L,G,LE	R,L,G,H,A,LE				R,L,G,H,A,LE
Comm. Anti-Drug Prog		R,L,G,H,A,LE				R,L,G,H,A,LE
Security Surveys	R,LE	R,H,A,LE	BO,LE	SA,LE	BO,LE	HA,BO,SA,LE

ACCESS CONTROL						
Guards		HA	BO	SA	BO	BO,LG
Secured/Keyed Doors	R,L,G,LE	R,HAP,A	BO	SA,P,A	BO	
Personal IDs	LG	LG,HAP	BO	SA	BO	
Locks	R	HA	BO	SA		
Fences	R,L,G,LE	LG,HAP,A	BO	SA,LG,P		R,L,G,P,A

SCHOOLS						
Truancy Programs	R,L,G,SA,LE	R,L,G,HA,SA,LE	R,L,G,BO,SA,LE			R,L,G,HA,BO,SA,LE
After-school Progs	R,L,G,SA,LE	R,L,G,HA,SA,LE	R,L,G,BO,SA,LE			R,L,G,HA,BO,SA,LE
Anti-bullying Progs				SA,ST,LE		SA,ST,LE
Competency Building						SA,EC
Behavior Mgmt.				R,SA,ST		R,SA,ST
DARE						SA,LE
School Atmosphere				SA,ST,LE		
Preschools						R,SA
Safe&Drug Free Schs.				SA,LE		
Zero Tolerance Policy				SA		
SRO's				SA,LE		
Alt. Schools/Progs				LG,SA,LE		

KEY:

R- residents/citizens

LG- local government

P- planners

LE- law enforce

SA- sch staff/adm

EC- entire community

HO- home owners

HA- housing authority

A- architects

BO- business own

ST- students

C- courts

RE- researchers

HOME	PUBLIC HOUSING	BUSINESS	SCHOOL	WORKPLACE	COMMUNITY
------	----------------	----------	--------	-----------	-----------

BUSINESS ISSUES					
Property Tagging			BO		
Inventory Control			BO		
Anti-theft Notices			BO		
Package Screening			BO		
Check Policies			BO		
Return Policies			BO,LE		BO,LE
Employee Screening			LG,BO,LE		LG,BO,LE
Business Imp. Districts			BO		
Theft Proof Items			BO		
Employee Supervision			BO		
Licensing	LG,LE	LG,LE	LG,LE		LG,LE
Monetary Policies			BO		
Staff Training			BO		
Ristrict Sales of Items	LG,BO,LE	LG,BO,LE	LG,BO,LE	LG,BO,LE	LG,BO,LE

PARTNERSHIPS					
C.O.P.S.		LE,EC		LE,EC	LE,EC
Weed and Seed					LG,P,LE,EC
Corrap. Communities		R,LG,LE,C,EC		R,SA,LE,EC	R,LG,SA,LE,C,EC
SACSI		R,LG,LE,C,EC		R,SA,LE,EC	R,LG,SA,LE,C,EC

MISCELLANEOUS					
Avoidance		R			R
Escorts		R			R
Curfews	R,LG,LE	R,LG,HA,LE	LG,LE	LG,LE	R,LG,LE
Pub. Educ./Media	LG,SA,LE	LG,SA,LE	LG,SA,LE	LG,SA,LE	LG,SA,LE
Mentoring					R,SA
Lifeskills Training					SA
Property Locators	R,LE	R,HA,LE	BO,LE	R,SA,LE	R,LG,BO,LE
Self-Defense		R,LE		R,SA,LE	R,LE
Tenant Screening		HA,LE			
Health Inspections		LG,HA			LG
Mediation/Dispute Resol	R,LG,C	R,LG,HA,C		R,SA,C	R,LG,C
Weapons/Firearms Conf.		R,LG,HA,LE	LG,BO,LE	LG,SA,LE	R,LG,BO,LE
Policy Development		R,LG,HA	BO	SA,ST,LE	BO
Anti-fencing Operations	LE,C	LE,C	BO,LE,C	LE,C	BO,LE,C
Civil Remedies	R,LG,C	R,LG,HA,C			R,LG,HA,C
Graffiti Boards	LG	LG,HA	LG,BO	LG,SA	LG
Reduce Incivilities	EC	EC	EC	EC	EC
Targeted Enforcement	LE	LE	LE	LE	LE
Anti-gang Activities	R,LG,SA,LE	R,LG,HA,SA,LE	R,LG,BO,SA,LE	R,LG,SA,LE	R,LG,BO,SA,LE